DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 886 HE 026 618

AUTHOR	Robyn, Abby E.; And Others
TITLE	Programs To Promote College Attendance That Combine Services and Financial Aid. A RAND Note.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, CA. Inst. for Education and Training.
SPONS AGENCY	Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
REPORT NO	RAND/N-3581-LE
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	70p.; For a related document, see HE 026 617.
AVAILABLE FROM	RAND, 1700 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138 ($11.50).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; *College Attendance; College Students; Economically Disadvantaged; Higher Education; High School Students; Minority Groups; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *School Holding Power; Secondary Education; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	*Program Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This study explored the range of service program approaches to promote college attendance, described typical programs, and reviewed issues related to program evaluation. A reputational sample of programs was obtained through interviews with 5 national higher-education organizations and 10 state departments of education, and through a literature review. Phone interviews were conducted with 24 program officers to gather information about how programs were established and their operation, funding, and assessment. The analysis found that programs are typically designed to address a number of factors negatively associated with attending college, including low income, low level of parent education, minority race and ethnicity, lack of college aspirations, poor academic achievement, and lack of information about college costs and financial aid. Most target low-income and/or minority students. Programs usually have a primary focus, such as increasing knowledge about college and financial options, promoting awareness of attending college, or fostering persistence once in college. Activities include cultural enrichment (events, mentors, summer and after-school programs); academic enrichment; educational and financial counseling; and financial incentives. The study also found that little is known about program effectiveness as evaluations are rare and usually focus on process measures. Contains program descriptions and 18 references. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 360 886

HE

A RAND NOTE

Programs to Promote College Attendance That Combine Services and Financial Aid

Abby E. Robyn, Stephen P. Klein,
Stephen J. Carroll, Susan J. Bell

HE026 618

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

RAND

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RAND

INSTITUTE ON
EDUCATION AND TRAINING

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The research described in this report was supported by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc.

RAND is a nonprofit institution that seeks to improve public policy through research and analysis. Publications of RAND do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the sponsors of RAND research.

Published 1993 by RAND
1700 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
To obtain information about RAND studies or to order documents,
call Distribution Services, (310) 393-0411, extension 6686

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A RAND NOTE

N-3581-LE

Programs to Promote College Attendance That Combine Services and Financial Aid

Abby E. Robyn, Stephen P. Klein,
Stephen J. Carroll, Susan J. Bell

Supported by the
Lilly Endowment, Inc.

RAND

INSTITUTE ON
EDUCATION AND TRAINING

RAND's Institute on Education and Training conducts policy analysis to help improve education and training for all Americans.

The Institute examines *all* forms of education and training that people may get during their lives. These include formal schooling from preschool through college; employer-provided training (civilian and military); post-graduate education; proprietary trade schools; and the informal learning that occurs in families, in communities, and with exposure to the media. Reexamining the field's most basic premises, the Institute goes beyond the narrow concerns of each component to view the education and training enterprise as a whole. It pays special attention to how the parts of the enterprise affect one another and how they are shaped by the larger environment. The Institute:

- examines the performance of the education and training system
- analyzes problems and issues raised by economic, demographic, and national security trends
- evaluates the impact of policies on broad, system-wide concerns
- helps decisionmakers formulate and implement effective solutions

To ensure that its research affects policy and practice, the Institute conducts outreach and disseminates findings to policymakers, educators, researchers, and the public. It also trains policy analysts in the field of education.

RAND is a private, nonprofit institution, incorporated in 1948, which engages in nonpartisan research and analysis on problems of national security and the public welfare. The Institute builds on RAND's long tradition—interdisciplinary, empirical research held to the highest standards of quality, objectivity, and independence.

Published 1993 by RAND
1700 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
To obtain information about RAND studies or to order documents,
call Distribution Services, (310) 393-0411, extension 6686

PREFACE

This Note describes programs designed to increase college participation by the early targeting of support services and financial incentives. The study was conducted, at the request of the Lilly Endowment, as an exploratory effort to look at options to promote college participation. It should be of value to decisionmakers and program administrators interested in learning more about the range and effectiveness of the recent proliferation of service-based programs. A companion report (Klein et al., 1992) evaluates the effects of the Lilly Endowment Education Award program, a college gift aid program.

SUMMARY

In the last decade, efforts to increase college participation and retention have produced a variety of program strategies. They include new approaches to delivering financial aid accompanied by a wide range of support services. Programs are targeted at precollegiate students or at retaining students already enrolled in college. The goals of service-based programs are to increase students' information about college, their academic preparation, and their motivation to attend. This study examines the range of service program approaches to promote college going, describes typical programs, and discusses issues related to program evaluation. The study did not attempt to produce a comprehensive catalogue of all existing programs, but rather to provide a representative sample of approaches. Appendix B contains detailed descriptions of representative programs.

METHODOLOGY

A reputational sample of programs was obtained through interviews with five national higher-education organizations and ten state departments of education, and through a literature review. Phone interviews were conducted with 24 program officers to gather information about how programs were established and their operation, funding, and assessment.

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Programs are typically designed to address a number of factors negatively associated with college going, including low income, low level of parent education, minority race and ethnicity, lack of college aspirations, poor academic achievement, and lack of information about college cost and financial aid. Most programs target low-income and/or minority students.

Programs usually have a primary focus, such as increasing knowledge about college and financial options, promoting awareness of college going, or fostering college retention. A wide range of program activities has been developed to meet these goals. Activities include the following.

- Cultural enrichment: trips to cultural events and local colleges, academic or business mentors, after-school and summer programs, counseling, parent involvement.

- Academic enrichment: tutoring and remedial help, study skills, test-taking skills, course scheduling, course upgrading.
- Educational and financial counseling: information about postsecondary opportunities and financial aid, provision of forms, help in filling out applications, test preparation workshops.
- Financial incentives: pay-for-grades, last-dollar scholarships, guaranteed tuition.

All the programs we studied offered more than one type of activity, and usually included a nontraditional form of financial aid, such as guaranteed tuition offered to 6th graders who persist in school and become eligible for postsecondary education; rewards for good grades that could later be applied to college expenses; or "last-dollar" scholarships that provide the final sums needed to ensure attendance after a college has assembled a student's full financial package.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Little is known about program effectiveness. Evaluations are rare, and when they do occur they focus on process measures (such as the number of pamphlets distributed or the number of hours of tutoring a student received) rather than on how the program affected college participation rates. More comprehensive evaluations are methodologically weak. In part, the limited nature of the evaluations derives from the difficulty of designing controlled experiments. However, unless such evaluations are undertaken, decisionmakers will lack reliable information on whether service-based programs combined with financial aid can increase college going, and which types of services are most effective.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We greatly appreciate the cooperation of the program administrators around the country who took great pains to describe their programs, provide us with descriptive materials, and refer us to other programs using alternative strategies.

We would also like to thank Susan Bodilly and Lynn Karoly, whose comments on a draft of this Note helped clarify its organization and strengthen its discussions. Linda Weiss and Karin Suede provided skillful assistance in preparing the manuscript.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

SUMMARY v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii

TABLES xi

Section

1. INTRODUCTION 1
   - Methodology 1
   - Organization 2

2. PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS 3
   - Program Activities 3
   - Program Focus 4
     - Knowledge of College and Financial Options 4
     - Awareness 6
     - Retention 7

3. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS 8
   - Evaluating Program Options 9

Appendix

A. LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEWED 13

B. DESCRIPTIONS OF PROGRAMS TO PROMOTE COLLEGE GOING 15
   - Cleveland Scholarship Program (CSP) 16
   - ACCESS; Higher Education Information Center; Boston Plan for Excellence 19
   - CollegeBound Foundation 23
   - Creating Higher Aspirations and Motivation Program (C.H.A.M.P.) 25
   - I Know I Can 27
   - I Have A Dream 29
   - Liberty Scholarship Program; Liberty Partnership Program 32
   - Mott Middle College 35
   - Career Beginnings 38
   - TRIO 40
   - Hillsborough County Center of Excellence, Inc. 43
   - Scholarship-in-Escrow (SIE) 46
   - Challenge for Excellence 48
   - M-Link 51
   - Academic Advancement Center 52
   - Supplemental Instruction (SI) 54
   - Nontraditional Financial Self-Help Programs 56

REFERENCES 59

TABLES

1. Service Programs to Promote College Going 5

1. INTRODUCTION

Efforts to increase participation in postsecondary education revolve largely around the provision of financial aid. The federal government alone contributes about $5.6 billion in the form of Pell grants, and states contribute another $1.7 billion. In the last decade, there has been increasing interest in widening the pool of college-bound students by varying the way financial aid is delivered. Several nontraditional approaches to delivering financial aid have been developed, including "last dollar" scholarships and early targeting through guaranteed tuition or other financial-incentive strategies. Besides delivering financial support differently, these new approaches incorporate a variety of support services that are integral to their goals. Support-service programs are aimed at increasing students' information about college, their academic preparation and motivation to attend, and their retention once enrolled. Although these approaches receive limited financial support compared to traditional scholarship programs, they reflect an ongoing concern to address a wider set of circumstances that may limit college participation.

METHODOLOGY

To identify new strategies to support college participation, we conducted interviews with five national organizations for higher education and ten state education agencies (see the list in Appendix A), and we conducted a literature review. We developed a reputational sample and from it we interviewed 24 program officers. From the interviews, project materials, and descriptions in the literature, we developed program descriptions that include each one's history, its financial base, details about its activities and staffing, and program assessment data. We did not intend to develop a comprehensive catalogue of all existing programs, but rather to describe a representative sample of program options.[1]

The initial geographical focus of the survey was the states neighboring Indiana, but we also investigated programs in other regions that were recommended by our respondents as particularly noteworthy. We also report some information we collected on nontraditional programs to pay for college, such as state- and college-guaranteed tuition programs, college savings bonds, and community work programs.

[1]There is no comprehensive list of service-based programs to promote college attendance. Two selective lists of programs are "A Sampler of Early Higher Education Awareness Programs," prepared by the Higher Education Information Center; and "Directory of Guaranteed Tuition Projects," prepared by the U.S. General Accounting Office.

ORGANIZATION

This study explores the range of program approaches to promote college going, describing typical programs and discussing issues relating to the evaluation of service-based programs. The information presented here is an overview, highlighting the features of these innovative approaches. In Section 2, we provide a summary of program characteristics, including the range of program activities and typical program goals and components. Section 3 discusses what we know about program effectiveness and provides some criteria for meaningful program evaluation. Readers seeking more detailed descriptions of representative programs should consult the catalog of programs contained in Appendix B.

2. PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Our review of the literature and our interviews with education program officers identified over one hundred service-based programs throughout the country designed to promote college going. These programs typically target low-income, minority students, a group that is often at risk of dropping out of school. These students are the least likely to attend college,[1] and thus financial aid in the form of grants and loans is the traditional remedy to increase their participation. But several other factors, negatively associated with college going, characterize these students: low level of parent education, little aspiration to attend college, poor academic achievement, and lack of information about college costs and about the availability of financial aid.[2] The conventional wisdom suggests that promoting college going is a complex problem, requiring a multifaceted response. All of the programs we identified provided more than one type of service to address perceived deficits, drawing from a wide menu of activities. In this section we describe the kind of activities that have been developed, and then the most typical combinations of activities.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Programs use a wide range of activities to meet student needs.

- Cultural enrichment: trips to cultural events and local colleges, academic or business mentors, after-school and summer programs, counseling, parent involvement.
- Academic enrichment: tutoring and remedial help in academic topics, study skills enhancement, test-taking skills, guidance in selecting college preparatory courses, upgrading schools' curricula to meet college preparatory standards.
- Educational and financial counseling: information about postsecondary opportunities and financial aid, provision of forms, help in filling out college and financial aid applications, test-preparation workshops.

---

[1]Using data from the National Center for Education Statistics' "High School and Beyond" data base, Pelavin and Kane (1990) report that with regard to college attendance within four years of high school graduation, over 58 percent of white students attend some college, compared to 47 percent of blacks and 45 percent of Hispanics. Among students from families with income less than $15,000, 42 percent attend college within four years of high school graduation, compared to 62 percent of students from families with income over $25,000.

[2]Articles that discuss the factors associated with college attendance include Cargile (1988); Hossler, Schmit, and Bouse (1991); Mingle (1987); Pelavin and Kane (1990); Post (1990); and St. John (1991).

- Financial aid: last-dollar scholarships, pay-for-grades, and guaranteed tuition.

Most, though not all, service programs include a financial component. When aid is included it is typically of a nontraditional sort. For example, after a college has assembled a full package of gift and loan aid, if there is still a gap between college costs and a student's ability to pay, programs may make up the difference with what is called a "last-dollar scholarship"; or to increase the incentive to graduate high school and perform well, programs may reward junior and senior high students with pay or credits for good grades, which can later be applied toward college costs. Another device for increasing motivation to attend college is for a philanthropist or organization to "adopt" a 6th grade class and then guarantee college tuition for all in the class who graduate high school and are eligible for further education.

PROGRAM FOCUS

Individual programs typically have a primary goal that dictates the combination of activities they select. Respondents characterized their programs as emphasizing one of three aims: increasing students' knowledge of their college and financial options; raising awareness of the possibility of going to college and appropriate preparation; or increasing college retention. Table 1 summarizes typical programmatic goals, targets, potential costs, number of students served, and the activities they incorporate. The information, unless otherwise noted, is drawn from our interviews and literature review.

Knowledge of College and Financial Options

Programs meeting the need for more information about college and financial aid opportunities, and for guidance in applying for admission and financial aid, target high school students on a city or statewide basis. Services range from mailing out informational flyers (such as the Indiana College Placement and Assessment Center's direct-mail college financial planning packet), to holding workshops (like Indiana's College Goal Sunday), to placing counselors on-site to help students select and apply for colleges, and proceed through the financial aid process and the required preadmission tests (as in the Cleveland Scholarship Program). Programs may also provide aid in terms of application fees and test fees, and they are often allied with last-dollar scholarship programs.

Last-dollar scholarships are granted by an organization after a student has been admitted to a college and the school has determined its full financial package and sent a financial aid letter to the student. These grants are "last dollar" because they are not

Table 1

Service Programs to Promote College Going

Goals	Target Grade Levels	Estimated Cost per Student per Year[a]	Typical Number Served	Activities/Financial Aid Component
Knowledge of college and financial options	11–12	$431	>1,000	College/financial counseling, forms, test preparation, fees, last-dollar scholarships
Raising awareness	6–12	$923	60 (1 class)	Tutoring, mentoring, counseling, trips, college/financial guidance, parent involvement, guaranteed tuition, pay-for-grades
College retention	12+	NA	100	College-based summer programs, tutoring, mentoring, academic/cultural enrichment, scholarships

[a]Estimates of cost per student per year are taken from a U.S. General Accounting Office study of guaranteed tuition programs (U.S. GAO, 1990b). The costs are estimated excluding financial aid. The GAO information is limited to the programs it was able to identify and represents only an estimate of program costs. GAO notes that its survey asked only about budgeted expenses (excluding volunteer services or donated resources), and moreover, staff may not have known the details of the program's annual expenses. Thus GAO's figures may be an underestimate of costs. Also, programs in the same category vary considerably in the types of services they offer. The GAO typology does not identify the costs of retention programs.

computed in the gift and loan aid package assembled by the college. Colleges, for example, have agreed with the Cleveland Scholarship Program that they will not take into account potential last-dollar awards. Traditional scholarship aid is figured in along with parent contribution, institutional assistance, and other gift aid and loans when the university computes the student's total financial package, balancing out various sources of funds to reach a specific financial aid target. Providing assistance using the last-dollar approach offers organizations an opportunity to earmark funds for specific groups of students regardless of the college financial aid package.

The programs to increase knowledge of college and financial options are sponsored by state agencies, individuals and organizations, businesses, and foundations. The average last-dollar scholarship grant in 1988–1989 according to GAO estimates, was $797 per student per year, while the average expense per student participant for college and financial advising was $431 (the median was $136/student) in 1988–1989 dollars. For descriptions of several examples of this kind of program, see Appendix B.

Awareness

Most early awareness programs are patterned on the model of Eugene Lang's "I Have a Dream" program. Eugene Lang adopted a 6th grade class at a Harlem elementary school and guaranteed college tuition for all those who would later be accepted and enroll at any college. In addition, a host of support services was provided, including cultural, academic, social, and informational services to help students qualify for college and to promote a college-going culture. Similar program models may delete the tuition guarantees or focus on partnerships between high schools and nearby colleges, but all provide a wide range of services, typically including mentoring, tutoring, trips, summer programs, and parent programs.

For the 1988–1989 school year, the GAO estimated a yearly per-pupil cost (excluding financial aid) of $923 for early awareness and $328 for university partnerships. The New York "I Have a Dream" Foundation estimates the total cost over the life of its program from class adoption through college to be $300,000–$500,000 for an initial class of about sixty students.

Awareness programs are typically sponsored by individuals or small groups of philanthropists. However, similar programs have been launched by corporations, foundations, and by the state of New York. New York's Liberty Partnership Program offers awards to coalitions of schools, community-based organizations, and higher education institutions to provide such services as tutoring, test preparation, counseling, enrichment, and parental involvement to "increase [students'] desire and motivation to complete school and to gain entry into post-secondary education" (from the program materials). In 1991–1992, 53 partnerships served approximately 14,000 at-risk students through the program. A companion scholarship program has had its funding deferred due to the state budget crisis. (For more information about the Liberty Partnership Program, see Appendix B.)

Another method of increasing early awareness of college going is to reward academic achievement and link those rewards to college attendance. Programs typically select a "pay-for-grades" approach, in which junior and senior high students earn money or credit for future higher education expenses by getting good grades in academic subjects. Funding in the programs we reviewed comes from businesses, foundations, and, in one program, from a federal matching grant. A very extensive example of this strategy is the Cleveland Scholarship-in-Escrow program, which has been operating since 1988. It rewards all Cleveland public school students in grades 7 through 12 with $40 for each A, $30 for each B, and $10 for each C. A student getting all A's and taking advanced classes could earn a

maximum award of $6000. These funds can be used anywhere in the country for continuing education. The program estimates expenses of $10 million for its current five-year pilot.

The Texas SouthMost Challenge for Excellence endowment scholarship program is a more limited example of a pay-for-grades approach. It gives students in the Brownsville, Texas, area credits for A and B grades, which can be used for tuition and fees at the University of Texas at Brownsville in partnership with Texas SouthMost College. Both the Cleveland and Texas programs have added a component to make parents aware of the value of further education, and the Cleveland program includes school advocates for a limited number of C students, for whom they coordinate support services. Typically, programs of this type provide few services, and thus their costs, excluding postsecondary financial aid, are minimal.

Retention

College retention programs typically focus on supplying tutoring, remedial services, and help in adjusting to college life. They incorporate many of the same activities as awareness programs (e.g., mentoring, tutoring, academic and cultural enrichment, and summer readiness programs), but their services are usually based on the college campus. Programs are typically targeted at minority students at academic risk. Financial aid is administered through the regular college assistance programs.

Programs are usually initiated by the college itself and staffed with college faculty and student peer advisers. Funding comes from the school and often from the relevant state department of education through grant programs to increase retention rates. An unusually extensive retention program was launched by Glassboro State College, in New Jersey. Many of its features are available to the whole freshman class, e.g., a two-day student/parent orientation program, a one-unit freshman seminar, faculty and adviser mentoring programs, and an Academic Advancement Center for tutoring and assessment. A summer precollege on-campus workshop and peer-mentoring program is designed specifically for minority students.

Another approach to retention targets the transition of minority students from community college to four-year institutions. Mott Community College cooperates with the University of Michigan in a program of extensive student counseling and articulated courses to facilitate this transition. Financial incentives are offered in the form of deferred fees and book fee waivers for the first semester.

3. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Little is known about the effectiveness of combined service and financial aid programs. Many of the programs are relatively new and are just reaching the stage where substantial numbers of their students could be expected to go to college. In addition, evaluation is rare, and when it does occur, it focuses on the program's process (such as how many students were served, how many pamphlets were distributed, or how many hours of counseling were supplied). Evaluations rarely examine whether the programs actually increase college going. The recent GAO analysis (GAO, 1990b) concluded that "the programs' current data-collection efforts do not appear to constitute comprehensive, systematic evaluations" (p. 5).

The systematic evaluations that are undertaken are often methodologically weak. For instance, a survey of Cleveland last-dollar scholarship recipients reported positive results in college going and persistence (Uyeki, 1988). However, surveys were returned by only 38 percent of the sample, and particularly by those students who had received greater assistance from the program; also, students' college attendance rates were not compared to the rates of students who had not received last-dollar scholarships, which casts doubt on the validity of the program's conclusion and, moreover, provides no evaluation of the effectiveness of its information and guidance aspects.

In another instance, an evaluation of an awareness program in which control groups were used and a 4.7 percent increase in the rate of college attendance was reported, there was tremendous variability at the seven program sites, ranging from a negative program impact to a 10 percent increase in the rate of college going over the control group (Cave and Quint, 1990). Implementation factors and the multitude of services students received in addition to the program offerings were identified as factors affecting the variability of outcomes. As with scholarship grants, it is often difficult to separate out the effects of a particular program because students may receive services from several sources.[1]

Keeping the above caveats in mind, there are some positive program results reported. There is an indication from one program that financial incentives increase the number of students getting good grades (Cleveland's Scholarship-in-Escrow program), but other programs report that many students may not meet the minimum grade criteria for rewards when they are set at A and B grades only (see GAO, 1990b and the evaluation section in the Challenge for Excellence program description in Appendix B). Awareness programs

[1]See Klein et al. (1992) for a discussion of difficulties in targeting scholarships to specific groups.

generally report positive results in retaining students into high school (GAO, 1990b; New York's "I Have a Dream"), but very few of these have students old enough to have graduated high school yet.

In part because so little is known about which types of programs are likely to have the largest impact on increasing rates of college going or which specific activities within a program are effective, the strategy of cities with a long history of promoting college attendance (e.g., Cleveland and Boston) is to offer a variety of loosely coordinated programs addressing all the major factors that are believed to be associated with it. Several states also use some state funds to support collaborative approaches: Ohio sponsors demonstration programs for communities to fill in the gaps in the range of services provided to students (the state spent $386,500 in 1991–1992). New York offers grants for awareness programs ($10.3 million in 1991–1992). And Kentucky is supporting awareness programs in junior high through collaborations between community colleges, universities, community groups, and schools ($336,000 in 1991–1992).

EVALUATING PROGRAM OPTIONS

The spread of service-based programs that promote college going underlines the need for improved program evaluations. To decide whether to invest in service-based programs and, if so, which services are likely to be most effective, decisionmakers need rigorous program evaluations and data that allow them to compare the benefits and costs of various services. Rigorous evaluations require comparisons between students in a program and a control group of students not receiving the program's services. Otherwise it is not possible to identify whether changes in college attendance occurred specifically because of the program or as a result of some other influence. As noted earlier, few evaluations of this type are currently being undertaken, and we speculate that in part this is because of the difficulty of establishing an appropriate experimental design.

Conducting rigorous evaluations of service-based programs entails a multitude of challenges. One of these is to establish a large enough sample to be able to generalize the program results. Though some programs exist in multiple sites, local responsiveness is often a key element in program delivery, and the array of services offered varies by program site. Moreover, programs evolve as they mature, changing the services they offer, their allocation of resources, and sometimes the students they target, thus presenting additional challenges to evaluators.

Identifying equivalent groups of students to serve as treatment and control groups also presents problems because of varying student and site characteristics. Once a sample has

been identified, it is necessary to insure that students in the program group all receive the same services and that students in the control group do not receive similar services through other agencies; also, none of the students in the sample can receive other services that may affect their college attendance. Because students are exposed to a variety of educational influences, including the school, family, child-care services, community groups, and the media, isolating program effects is a key evaluation concern.

Yet another concern is measuring implementation factors. Was a program implemented as it was intended? Was the quality of activities as expected? Was staff involvement and commitment in accord with the program design? Data about program implementation can often help explain variations in assessment.

Programs that collect data typically have information on program characteristics (e.g., types of services offered, number of students participating in various activities), staffing, and student characteristics (e.g., ethnicity, grade level). Rarely do programs have baseline data on services provided before program initiation; college participation rates; detailed financial data, including information on the value of volunteer services, in-kind contributions, and expenses by program for staff with multiple responsibilities; or data on services supplied by other agencies. Establishing a set of indicators for program evaluation would be a valuable first step to enable appropriate data collection.

After establishing evaluations for specific programmatic approaches, the next step is to determine which components of a program are producing the difference. A systematic comparison is needed across a wide variety of program strategies. This type of comparison would help identify the relative role of a program's support services versus its financial components. For example, to determine whether it is the services or the tuition guarantees that affect college participation rates in awareness programs, it is necessary to compare equivalent programs whose only difference is whether they include tuition guarantees. This kind of variation does occur and might make comparative studies feasible. New York state, for example, funds awareness programs that parallel the "I Have a Dream" program but do not include guaranteed tuition. Other awareness programs highlight pay-for-grades and accompany the financial incentives with varying amounts of support services. Currently, there are no detailed programmatic data with which to undertake comparative studies. An effort by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO, 1990b) to report on tuition guarantee programs points out the variability in program offerings and, in particular, the difficulty in obtaining accurate financial data.

Other questions that need to be addressed include the effectiveness of service-based programs compared to more traditional financial programs, and the appropriate targeting of

programs. Would it be more productive to invest in programs targeted at precollegiate students than to enlarge the pool of gift aid available? How much can college-going participation be increased by providing support services to various students with differing educational deficits? Are students already demonstrating a specific threshold level of academic achievement (e.g., C minus) more likely to move over into the college-going category than those at the lower end of the achievement scale?

Results from rigorous program evaluations will take time, since students must be followed through secondary school and on into their postsecondary settings before the outcomes are available. They are also a challenge to evaluation designers. But unless such evaluations are undertaken, decisionmakers cannot make effective decisions on the best use of resources to enhance college going.

Appendix A
LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEWED

HIGHER EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC)
American Association for Higher Education (AAHE)
American Council on Education (ACE)

STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Indiana and Neighboring States

Illinois Board of Higher Education
Indiana Commission on Higher Education
Kentucky Council on Higher Education
Michigan Department of Higher Education Management Services
Ohio Board of Regents

Other States With Innovative Programs

California Post-Secondary Commission
Florida Department of Education
Massachusetts Board of Regents
New York Board of Regents
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Appendix B
DESCRIPTIONS OF PROGRAMS TO PROMOTE COLLEGE GOING

KNOWLEDGE OF COLLEGE AND FINANCIAL AID OPTIONS PROGRAMS

Cleveland Scholarship Program (CSP), Cleveland, Ohio

ACCESS, Higher Education Information Center, Boston Plan for Excellence, Boston, Massachusetts

CollegeBound Foundation, Baltimore, Maryland

Creating Higher Aspirations and Motivation Program, New Jersey

I Know I Can, Columbus, Ohio

AWARENESS PROGRAMS

I Have a Dream, New York City and Albany, New York

Liberty Scholarship Program; Liberty Partnership Program, New York

Mott Middle College, Genessee County, Michigan

Career Beginnings, Brandeis University, Massachusetts

TRIO, U.S. Government

Hillsborough County Center of Excellence, Inc., Hillsborough, Florida

Scholarship-in-Escrow (SIE), Cleveland, Ohio

Challenge for Excellence, Texas SouthMost Community College in Partnership with the University of Texas, Brownsville, Texas

COLLEGE RETENTION PROGRAMS

M-Link, Mott Middle College, University of Michigan, Flint, Michigan

Academic Advancement Center, Glassboro State College, New Jersey

Supplemental Instruction, University of Missouri, Kansas City, Missouri

NONTRADITIONAL FINANCIAL SELF-HELP PROGRAMS

Guaranteed Tuition

College Savings Bonds

Public Service

CLEVELAND SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM (CSP)

Program emphasis: Knowledge of college and financial aid options.

General program components; target group: Program features include college and financial aid counseling; last-dollar scholarships; payment of test/application fees if not waived; leverage additional financial aid for students.

Program goal(s): To attack the low number of student applications for college and for grants. Markus Foundation research showed that students did not know how to fill out forms and did not think they were eligible for assistance, and so did not make use of scholarships/loans provided by the foundation.

Initiated by: In 1967, the Markus Foundation formed a nonprofit organization and raised funds from businesses, foundations, and individuals to support the program.

Funds; program costs per year: The program has raised $6 million over 20 years for scholarships; $4 million over 20 years for specialized counseling services; and leveraged $70 million in aid over 20 years from federal, state, and institutional sources by helping students identify financial aid sources and complete applications for funds. They were able to serve 91.5 percent of the students eligible for last-dollar scholarships in 1990–1991.

In 1990–1991, operating expenses plus salaries, payroll taxes, and employee benefits were $821,000. Student grants, scholarships, and fees totaled $600,000. Of the budget expenses, 39 percent are for high school college-planning advisers and 15 percent for financial aid counseling to last-dollar scholarship students, including those already in college still receiving grants.

Staffing: Staff includes five full-time professionals, three part-time professionals, five secretarial, and twenty-two part-time financial aid advisers who work one to four days a week as needed.

Program description: According to the program administrator, financial counselors provide "detailed advice on how to apply for college and on when and how to qualify for financial aid, along with encouragement to stay in school." Counselors obtain college applications and entrance exam applications, they cover test and application fees and housing deposits as needed, they help students fill out forms, and they hold parent conferences, college nights, assemblies, and open houses. The program is free to Cleveland public high schools and is operating in all 19 of them. It is provided on a contract basis (to recover operating costs) to 21 private high schools.

Finalists for last-dollar scholarship funds are selected from among high school seniors based on grade point average (2.5), college entrance test scores, financial need, and completion of college admission and aid applications. The average student grant in 1990–1991 was $490. The program reports that it is able to find fifteen dollars in aid for students for every dollar it spends.

Students must attend college full time and maintain a C average to remain in the program. Students may continue to receive last-dollar scholarships for up to five years of college. On every campus where there are at least 15 entering freshman in the CSP program, there is a peer-counseling program to aid in retention.

The Cleveland Scholarship Program also administers other scholarship funds, has piloted an early awareness program, and is piloting a corporate mentor program for college students.

Changes in program implementation: In the 1970s, the initiative to leverage other aid funds for students was improved on the advice of an outside expert. Students must now have a 2.5 grade point average to be considered for the grant program. Several new programs have been started: there is now a program for students 25 or older. Next year it will offer seventy $1000 awards. There is also a corporate mentoring program for college students to ease the transition from school to work.

Program evaluation: The program has served 60,000 students over 20 years and has provided more than $6 million in last-dollar grants. It has leveraged $70 million in aid over 20 years from federal, state, and institutional sources.

In 1990–1991, out of the 3000 Cleveland public high school seniors, the program had counseled 1750. Including private students, it counseled 3800 students. It paid out $33,000 in fees and $340,000 in grants. Awards were given to 400 freshman.

A 1988 evaluation by Eugene Uyeki, of Case Western Reserve, surveyed a random sample of students receiving scholarships from CSP. The survey return rate was 38 percent. Among respondents, 90 percent attended a four-year college; 77 percent finished college—64 percent of two-year college students and 80 percent of four-year college students; graduation rate for blacks was 76 percent and for whites it was 85 percent; 85 percent of respondents attended Ohio colleges; more than half were the first in their family to attend college; 44 percent had annual family income of $5000–$15,000; and the more aid received from CSP, the more likely a student was to graduate from a four-year college. [Note: The survey return rate was higher for students receiving multiple grants. Baseline data on college participation rates before the program initiation are unavailable.]

The program was a pioneering effort and was designated a model program by President Reagan's Task Force on Private-Sector Initiatives, and the U.S. Department of Education sponsored a conference for 23 cities to discuss similar strategies. Columbus, Dayton, and Cuyahoga County (Ohio), Norfolk, Richmond, and Alexandria (Virginia), and Boston, Baltimore, New York, and Miami are among the cities influenced by the Cleveland program. Two companion programs are described below.

Cleveland Initiative for Education: Established in 1986 to increase the holding power of schools and offset the 50 percent drop-out rate. The program was initiated by the Cleveland School District Superintendent. School-to-work youth transition programs provide summer jobs and priority hiring for Cleveland public high school graduates. Youth Opportunities Unlimited, a nonprofit organization, conducted job-readiness training and arranged summer jobs for 2000 students and community service projects for 600 students.

Scholarship-in-Escrow (SIE) plan: Begun in 1987, with the details worked out by a task force of the Greater Cleveland Roundtable, and bank accounts devised by Ameritrust. The program rewards students for good grades in grades 7 through 12. Students earn $40 for each A, $20 for each B, and $10 for each C in five core academic subjects, plus $10 for each honors class. Students must spend this money on continuing education within eight years or forfeit it. (Students leaving the system also forfeit the money.) Students began earning SIE dollars in February 1988.

Reference sources: Joseph Cronin, "Corporate Support for Scholarships: A Tale of Two Cities," in A. M. Hauptman and R. H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College*, American Council on Education, MacMillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991, pp. 129–147. Interview with Christina Ryan Milano, Executive Director of CSP. Interview with Rosie Dowdy, Executive Director of SIE. Program brochures and materials.

ACCESS
HIGHER EDUCATION INFORMATION CENTER (HEIC)
BOSTON PLAN FOR EXCELLENCE

Program emphasis: Knowledge of college and financial aid options.

General program components: A variety of loosely coordinated Boston programs provide financial aid counseling, scholarship funds, early awareness pamphlets, financial aid application forms, college and career counseling, and practice in taking SATs and ACTs. Programs target students in grades 9–12.

Program goal(s): Concerns included the complexity of financial aid application forms; limited counseling time available to students from high school counselors; eligible students not getting aid and students without aid dropping out. Among Boston public high school graduates receiving no aid, 27 percent dropped out during the first semester and 51 percent registered for the second semester. Rates of persistence for students getting aid were higher. "Students without any form of aid have significantly lower chances of staying in college."[1] ACCESS was founded to insure that all academically qualified Boston public school students would be able to go to college.

Initiated by: The educational interests of several different groups came together in the early 1980s to start a variety of programs. The school superintendent, Dr. Robert Spillane, sought help from the business community and higher education institutions. The Chamber of Commerce had formed a new education committee. The Private Industry Council (PIC) announced an initiative to bring the schools and corporate community together.

In the early 1980s, the public schools, business, and higher education came together to sign two compacts, one between the public schools and business and the other between the public schools and higher education institutions. The Boston Compact goals include: (1) increasing attendance, (2) increasing test scores, and (3) providing job or college opportunity for every high school graduate. In 1982, the PIC agreed to provide summer jobs and consideration for full-time jobs for high school graduates if the schools would raise attendance rates and test scores and lower the dropout rate for each of five years. Four hundred companies signed the compact. Compact members later agreed to let public high

---

[1]Peter Langer, "Patterns of Enrollment, Year 3: The Local College Enrollment of Boston Public School Graduates," paper presented to the Fenway Retention Consortium Symposium, Simmons College, June 1987; cited in Joseph Cronin, "Corporate Support for Scholarships: A Tale of Two Cities," in A. M. Hauptman and R. H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College*, American Council on Education, MacMillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991, pp. 129–147.

school graduates who completed postsecondary education interview for professional/ managerial jobs. In addition, the PIC established 14 work groups, including one on higher education that recruited volunteers to counsel students about financial aid.

Presidents of 25 higher education institutions agreed to increase the number of enrollees in higher education by 25 percent and to increase financial aid in return for stronger academic preparation by the schools.

Funds: Funds for scholarships, information, and guidance came from a variety of businesses, foundations, and higher education institutions. After signing the Boston Compact, higher education institutions contributed an additional $15 million in scholarships to Boston high school graduates.

The Jessie Cox Fund provided a start-up grant for a Higher Education Information Center (HEIC). City, state, and federal funds and the 25 higher education institutions helped finance the center.

Polaroid provided a small grant to begin a scholarship program. The insurance company New England Life gave $1 million to endow ACCESS and then spearheaded a plan to raise $5 million so that aid would be available not just to freshmen. The Boston Foundation agreed to a $1 million challenge grant on a two-for-one basis. The Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corporation, a nonprofit organization, contributed $1 million to endow the counseling and information components. The Bank of Boston created an urban education endowment called the Boston Plan for Excellence, with $1.5 million in school improvement grants.

Program descriptions: *HEIC.* The HEIC (located in the Boston Public Library) was started in 1984 and funded by the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission and (in part) by the State Higher Education Coordinating Council as a clearinghouse for higher education information and coordinator of early awareness programs. The center has a toll-free 800 number to give information on postsecondary education and training opportunities and assistance on completing college application forms or financial aid forms. It also provides information on different careers and how to prepare for them and on GED and ESL programs. The College Board office helped HEIC provide practice test-taking sessions for SAT and ACT, and it offered guidance to staff on scoring the tests and reporting weaknesses to students. HEIC is the informal coordinator of Boston programs.

The center distributes about 300,000 brochures a year describing the services it provides. The center is open 9 to 9, Monday through Thursday, and 9 to 5, Friday and Saturday. About 90 percent of the calls are received from people 20 years old and over—mostly parents and adults. Ninth graders receive early awareness information and trips to

nearby suburban colleges wanting to recruit urban students, and a bilingual booklet about course decisions.

ACCESS. In 1983, Dr. Robert I. Sperber of Boston University, director of the Higher Education Partnership Steering Committee, and Harry Johnson of Polaroid led a Chamber of Commerce committee to create new scholarships. The group was briefed on the Cleveland Scholarship Program, particularly the fact that private dollars generated ten times as much in public and college aid. Created in 1984, ACCESS provides last-dollar scholarships and financial aid counseling. Five advisers work at the schools every morning. Each day, one of the five works at the HEIC in the afternoon. ACCESS counselors are paid the equivalent of a substitute teacher. The money is raised from foundations, corporations, and higher education. Mario Pena is the director of ACCESS, and he is also executive director of the Boston Plan for Excellence.

Boston Plan for Excellence. Through this program, six endowments provide grants to improve the schools. Although the focus is on school reform, the product would be increased college going. ACCESS is the only direct service endowment.

Program evaluation: Several evaluations have been conducted of the Boston programs. None of them was readily available. Eleanor Farrar did a qualitative study on the Boston Compact. ACCESS has a follow-up study. HEIC has an outside evaluation and an evaluation of 8th grade work.

How might the programs be made more effective? Staff report the following long-range problems regarding program effectiveness. Financing will be a big problem down the road. Three years ago, ACCESS could meet the needs of all who applied. This year it can meet only 50 percent of the need of those who are eligible. Pell grants are not keeping up. Institutional dollars have not gone down yet because institutions must make gifts to keep their enrollments up. If educational reform efforts succeed, more students will be eligible for college, and there will not be enough money to pay attendance costs.

Programs that are in place are generally considered to be operating effectively, but the classroom situation is not adequate. The schools are terrible, and there is nothing for the students to do after school. Most 9th graders are not passing the academic courses. The course content and the teaching are poor. Students come to school hungry and with holes in their shoes. The schools need to provide a sustained, enriched educational experience. Boston's dropout rate is 35 percent, but that is an improvement from the previous 47 percent. The educational focus in the city is moving toward basic educational reform. The American Association of Higher Education has started collaborations of school and nonschool people to improve schools.

Reference sources: Joseph Cronin, "Corporate Support for Scholarships: A Tale of Two Cities," in A. M. Hauptman and R. H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College*, American Council on Education, MacMillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991, pp. 129–147. Interviews with Ann Coles, Executive Director, Higher Education Information Center, Senior Vice President, Education Resources Institute.

COLLEGEBOUND FOUNDATION
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Program emphasis: Knowledge of college and financial aid options.

General program components: The CollegeBound Foundation is an independent endowment fund that provides funding to encourage and enable more Baltimore City public high school graduates to pursue postsecondary education. It calls itself a "problem solving organization," seeking to remove barriers that prevent students from continuing their education. The program provides college-awareness counseling targeted to ninth and tenth graders, and financial aid through last-dollar scholarships.

Program goals: The Foundation was concerned about the lack of information, the need for help with financial forms, absence of a college-going culture/motivation, financial need, drop-out rates, and poor academic achievement.

Initiated by: In 1988, the Greater Baltimore Committee (GBC), the Baltimore United Interracial Leadership Development (BUILD), and the mayor of Baltimore all joined forces to facilitate school reform by creating the Foundation.

Funds: The Baltimore business community has made a commitment to raise a $25 million permanent endowment and to provide resources that will insure increased opportunities for high school students. Half of the pledges have come from local businesses (such as Baltimore Gas and Electric, Westinghouse, Noxell, Rouse Co., First National Bank, and Maryland National Bank); the other half have come from foundations. The program was incorporated two and a half years ago as an independent endowment fund. So far, $13 million in pledges has been received toward the $25 million goal.

Program description: The main thrust of this three-year-old program is to encourage students in the 16 city high schools and show them that college is a viable option. "We think there are two things that prevent kids from going to college: information and money," says a respondent, "So our main message is that college is possible and that jobs of the future require more education." CollegeBound maintains a staff of four full-time and three part-time counselors, who go into the city high schools and conduct workshops on various phases of the college process, including filling out applications, completing financial aid forms, and registering for SAT examinations. The counselors also pursue students who have dropped out of school. The program awards last-dollar scholarships ranging from $682 to $1100.

Program evaluation: The program reports a 2.5 percent increase in the percentage of students taking the SAT in the city high schools, compared with a 7 percent decrease

across the state and a 2 percent downturn nationwide. The proportion of students completing financial aid forms has increased from 23 percent in 1990 to 34 percent in 1991. One hundred seventy-nine students have received last-dollar scholarships, totaling $174,000, for the 1991–1992 school year. Among students receiving CollegeBound funding, 85 percent returned to college for their sophomore and junior years, compared with a national return rate of 70 percent for freshmen and 73 percent for sophomores.

Reference: Interview with Joyce Kroeller, Director, CollegeBound Foundation; program materials.

CREATING HIGHER ASPIRATIONS AND MOTIVATION PROGRAM (C.H.A.M.P.)
NEW JERSEY

Program emphasis: Knowledge of college and financial aid options.

General program components: C.H.A.M.P. locates financial aid, information, and counseling. The target group is high school students (10th to 12th grade).

Program goal(s): The program's goals are to promote college going, identify financial aid, promote academic achievement, and decrease drop-out rates.

Initiated by: In 1988, the director of Glassboro State College initiated the program in an attempt to make the Camden High School campus more appealing to at-risk students and to prevent dropping out.

Funds: Initially, in 1988–1989, the New Jersey Department of Higher Education contributed $130,640 for the pilot program; during 1989–1990, the New Jersey Department of Higher Education contributed $110,000; during 1989–1991, William Penn Foundation contributed $232,600; during 1990–1991, Camden Country Freeholders contributed $94,872 and the New Jersey Department of Higher Education contributed $87,834; and during 1991–1992, the New Jersey Department of Higher Education contributed $103,200, Camden Country Freeholders contributed $50,000, and Camden City School System plus two counselors contributed $25,000.

Glassboro State College provides space for C.H.A.M.P., but it is managed as a separate cost grant center and tracked separately from the college. The college pays some salaries and provides small stipends to students for "pocket money" to help offset expenses that are not met by money from summer jobs.

Staffing: Four full-time staff counsel, teach, and tutor students to prepare for the SATs, and they conduct other activities to get students ready for college. In addition, five part-time staff from the college tutor C.H.A.M.P. students as well as the regular students, and four full-time staff from the college counsel and assist with admissions questions and problems and any needs students have as they prepare for college.

Program description: According to a respondent, the city school system in Camden was considered one of the worst districts in the state, plagued by the typical problems of urban poverty. So in order to begin to change the failure cycle of dropping out, C.H.A.M.P. was created by the county council of Camden and Glassboro State College. The program is targeted to help at-risk high school students develop better skills in taking the SAT exam, and to encourage students to aspire to college attendance by providing tours of college

campuses as well as locating scholarships and financial aid opportunities. Approximately 200 students each year in grades 10 through 12 are reached by this program.

Evaluation: There is no evaluation of the C.H.A.M.P. program.

References: Interview with Dr. Linda Ross, Vice President, Glassboro State College, New Jersey; program materials.

I KNOW I CAN
COLUMBUS, OHIO

Program emphasis: Knowledge of college and financial aid options, early awareness.

General program components: I Know I Can provides financial aid, mentoring, information, and financial aid counseling for elementary, middle, and senior high school students and their parents.

Program goal(s): The program's goals are to promote a college-going culture and motivation, provide guidance in filling out financial forms, and provide last-dollar assistance. Ohio is ranked 38th in the nation in adults who do not attend college (despite the fact that the state does not have a high number of immigrants or minorities). The program director says that two reasons for this may be: many students graduated from high school and took jobs in industry or business; and access to higher education is not easy and is expensive. The state did not have any community colleges until two years ago, and many of the private colleges, such as Oberlin, are quite expensive.

Initiated by: The program was started in 1987, by a small group of local businessmen, school district leaders, and foundation directors including the Chamber of Commerce, the Columbus Foundation, the president of Kobacker Shoe Corporation, the superintendent of the Columbus Public Schools, and a current board member. Their goal was to plan and institute a healthy city school system by encouraging more students to continue on to higher education.

Funds: The Columbus Foundation was the outside catalyst for the program and contributed $89,000. The Columbus School District has a contract to contribute $125,000 plus provide free office space. Also, the state of Ohio has contributed $500,000 a year toward creating a $2 million endowment fund for student grants. Local individual contributions have totaled as much as $500,000.

A number of "site-based" partnerships have been formed in various neighborhoods around the city to provide single scholarships for students. In addition, funds are acquired from a payroll-deduction plan provided by the district for employees.

Program description: Every high school senior is a voluntary participant in the plan. There are three main program goals.

1. The plan provides last-dollar grant assistance to those qualified students who have "demonstrated a need," i.e., the student has pursued all other forms of financial aid, has met the college priority deadline, received the college financial aid package, and still has unmet financial need. In three years (1987–1990), the amount of last-dollar grants paid to qualified

students has risen from $54,102 to $457,181; the number of students receiving last-dollar grants has risen from 131 to 573; and the average dollar amount for last-dollar grants has risen from $412 to $797. Students can move in and out of the program and can requalify. Students are tracked the entire four years of their education as a requirement by the state. The program focuses on students "most at risk."

2. The program counsels students and their parents regarding financial aid. This means helping qualified students find scholarships or aid in addition to I Know I Can funds. In the last three years, the program has counseled over 3500 students, and nearly 1500 families have attended workshops. The amount of funding found for students (excluding last-dollar grants) has grown from $963,653 in 1987 to $5,306,305 in 1990, and for every dollar the program gives to students, about $13 is located from other sources. For the last four years, the total amount awarded in last-dollar grants from local funds was $1.2 million.

3. The program motivates and encourages elementary, middle, and high school students to stay in school and pursue postsecondary education. This is being accomplished with the help of school counselors, CBE consultants and numerous volunteers who inform students about the importance of education and the availability of financial aid.

Staffing: There are five paid employees and over 200 unpaid volunteers who have donated more than 15,000 hours of service in three years.

Evaluation: The program started as a pilot in 1988, with four schools in the Cleveland area. At the present time it is "citywide," and 17 high schools are being served. The results from tracking the graduating class of 1988 found that there was a 65 percent retention rate and in 1989 a 62 percent retention rate. The retention rate was over 60 percent for last-dollar grant recipients: 475 students.

Reference: Interview with Joanne Davis, Executive Director; program materials.

I HAVE A DREAM
NEW YORK

NOTE: There are over 140 I Have A Dream (IHAD) programs. Described below is the original program, which was based in an East Harlem elementary school; the operation of the IHAD foundation; and an example of a current program in Albany, New York.

General program components; target group: IHAD programs include mentoring, tutoring, personal counseling for students and families, coordination of social services, recreation, field trips, college trips, college readiness, summer jobs, vocational training, high school articulation, parent involvement, college and financial counseling, guaranteed college tuition.

Program goal(s): The program was founded to motivate disadvantaged youngsters to stay in school and obtain a high school diploma by providing programmatic support and the assurance of college tuition.

Initiated by: The original program was initiated in 1981 by Eugene Lang, who spontaneously told a class (N=60) of graduating 6th graders at P.S. 121 in East Harlem, "Go and graduate from high school and I'll give each of you a college scholarship." Lang hired a coordinator to work with students and their families. Each student was approached as an individual with individual needs to be addressed. Families were involved, social services coordinated, and field trips provided.

IHAD foundation programs are currently initiated by individuals or small groups of private philanthropists. Sponsors agree to adopt an elementary class; they spend personal time with the students and fund the program, including the academic, cultural, and social support components and a full-time coordinator. Each program establishes an activity base with a local community facility.

The Albany Dreamers program was initiated by E. Richard and Janet Yulman for 6th graders at Arbor Hill Elementary School, Albany, in January 1988. It involves a cooperative agreement between SUNY at Albany, School of Education, and the Albany School district.

Funds: There are currently over 140 "Dream" sponsors of programs involving about 10,000 students. Program costs range from about $300,000–$500,000 for a class of sixty 6th graders from initiation through college, including support services and tuition. In New York, the cost is about a half million dollars (averaging out to $833/student/year across ten years).

Students receive tuition funds based on the state university system. About 50 colleges have agreed to offer "dream" students a full financial package covering all expenses.

Funding for the Albany program involves a commitment from the Yulmans of more than $500,000 (including four years of tuition up to a maximum equivalent to the amount charged at the University at Albany that year). The program also got support commitments from many surrounding private colleges to provide the full financial aid package students would need to attend, and corporate commitments for jobs and enrichment activity support.

Staffing: The IHAD foundation requires sponsors to hire a full-time project coordinator.

For the Albany program, there is a Project Director, case management by a Program Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator, an advisory board of state and county agencies, a parents' steering committee, a group of university faculty who designed both the program and a comparative study, university graduates and undergraduate mentors and tutors (paid or class credit).

Program description: In the Albany program, the University has responsibility for program direction. The principles it developed are that (1) individual student needs would determine activities and interventions, (2) parental activity would be required and involvement encouraged, and (3) nondiscrimination. The University coordinates services to children and provides academic, cultural, and recreational facilities, mentors and tutors; and it makes continuing education programs available to the parents, monitors students' performance, coordinates with the district, and helps students and parents plan. The district provides office space for the coordinator and assistant coordinator, makes student records available, facilitates student case management, and provides public relations.

The "Dream" programs provide lots of personal attention, support, and enrichment besides the promised college funding assistance. In the Albany program, the University shows tremendous commitment (as do the Yulmans), and the program seems to require no cash expenditure by the district. What motivated the University to assume this role? The university reports that the project is supportive of its mission of teaching and service: faculty develop better links with the community, undergraduates gain teaching experience, and the mission of research in the public interest is furthered.

Program evaluation: Because it is the oldest program, the original East Harlem program has the most data available. Forty-eight out of the 51 students who remained in Harlem graduated high school, 36 enrolled in college, and two have graduated four years after the completion of high school. A national evaluation is currently beginning under the direction of Public Private Venture.

An evaluation component is also incorporated into the Albany program. Students in it will be followed for ten years; a cohort one year younger and one year older from the same school will also be followed. Record data, test scores, activity participation, and interview data will be collected, and costs will be identified.

Program changes: With the addition of more programs, there is now coordination between nearby programs and with non-IHAD programs such as the federal programs Upward Bound and Talent Search. Programs have added incentives for merit and progress and also contracts for students and families.

References: Interview with Tony Lopez, director of the New York IHAD foundation. Interview with Joan Seznick, assistant to E. Lang. Program materials. R. H. Koff, "Philanthropy, the Public School, and the University: The Albany Dreamers' Program as a Model for At Risk Youth," in A. M. Hauptman and R. H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College*, American Council on Education, MacMillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991, pp. 110–121.

LIBERTY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM; LIBERTY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM
NEW YORK

Program emphasis: Awareness.

General program components: There are two Liberty programs: The first provides scholarship aid for graduates of public high schools in New York state with a financial need; the second provides counseling and support services to prevent drop-outs in elementary and secondary New York schools.

Program goal(s): The Liberty programs were initiated as part of a pledge to cut the drop-out rate in half over the next five years, made in 1988 by Governor Mario Cuomo. The scholarship program was intended to insure that lack of funds would not prevent students admitted to a college in New York from attending college. The program provides funds for nontuition expenses and designs a financial package in conjunction with other aid programs to meet all college costs. The Partnership Program is "designed to provide youth at risk of dropping out of school with comprehensive services designed to increase their desire and motivation to complete school and to gain entry into postsecondary education, or where more appropriate, meaningful employment" (from program materials).

Initiated by: The pledge by Governor Cuomo as part of the "Decade of the Child" in 1988 was the catalyst for the programs. The Partnership Program began in 1989–1990. Funding for the scholarship program has been deferred due to budget constraints.

Funds: The Partnership Program awards state grants to consortia of postsecondary institutions, school, and community-based organizations on a competitive basis to provide services to students at risk of dropping out. In 1990–1991, the program received $13.3 million from the state, $2.59 million in institutional aid, and $4.159 million in leveraged aid (corporate, foundation, individuals, business). The state budget for the program was cut to $10.3 million in 1991–1992, and currently the recommended 1992–1993 budget is zero because of the state budget crisis.

As part of the scholarship program, the state Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) maximum award levels were raised, and more funds were made available to middle class students. TAP awards are available to students with a family net taxable income up to $50,500. However, as noted above, funding for the scholarship program has been deferred.

Program description: *Liberty Partnership Program.* Programs are required to form a coalition between schools, community-based organizations (CBOs), and higher education institutions. The programs are typically lodged within a CBO. The grant recipient and fiduciary agent is the higher education institution. Students between grades 5 and 12 are

targeted. Since most dropouts in New York occur at the 9th grade, the programs try to begin in earlier grades. The largest number of students served are in grades 7 to 9. Services that may be provided include: skills assessment, tutoring, academic and personal counseling, mentoring, family counseling, home visits, after-school enrichment, financial aid counseling, testing preparation, and staff development. All programs must offer tutoring, testing preparation, counseling, after-school enrichment, and parental involvement, but they need not target every student with each component. The intent of the state was to encourage locally designed programs with lots of variation.

In 1991–1992, there were 53 partnerships involving 370 schools, 271 CBOs, and 85 postsecondary institutions. Approximately 14,000 students were served. Grants range from $86,000 to $565,000, with an average grant size of $250,000.

Each program is visited by a state monitor once or twice a year. Regular technical assistance workshops are held.

Liberty Scholarship Program. The scholarship program is an entitlement program. Requirements are that the student: must be a New York state student, completing high school or receiving a General Equivalency Diploma (GED), and pursuing higher education in New York state; must begin college within two years of graduation (or GED); must be less than 22 years old at the time of the first award; receive a Pell Grant; receive a Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) award if a full-time student; be an undergraduate receiving a TAP or state scholarship for the first time in 1991–1992.

Awards are based on income. They are reduced $1.00 for every $3.00 of adjusted gross income above $18,000. Though there is no income eligibility ceiling, the formula targets low-income students. Students electing to attend a private college receive an amount equal to what they would have received had they attended a state university.

Liberty funds are used for nontuition expenses such as room and board, transportation, books, and supplies. Other state and federal aid programs are used to cover tuition expenses.

Note: The state of New York offers considerable financial aid to low-income students. Students can receive $3500–$4000 for tuition, plus Pell grants, and institutional aid.

Program evaluation: The Liberty Partnership Program requires collection of record data (e.g., test scores, grade level, grade average, retention in grade or promotion, risk factors, graduation rate, college-going rate of graduates), and program process data (e.g., number of students served, number of contact hours, type of activities, time per activity). There is no treatment/control evaluation design. A systemwide evaluation is currently being

conducted. In 1990–1991, 677 students graduated (78 percent of seniors in the program), and 59 percent were accepted in postsecondary institutions.

Reference sources: P. J. Keitel, "New York State's Liberty Scholarship Program," in A. M. Hauptman and R. H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College*, American Council on Education, MacMillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991, pp. 122–128. Interview with Jeanine Grinage, Director, Division of Post Secondary Equity and Access Programs, Acting Bureau Chief, Liberty Partnership Program. Liberty Partnership Program materials.

MOTT MIDDLE COLLEGE
GENESSEE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

Program emphasis: Awareness.

General program components: This program features dual high school and community college enrollment, mentoring, academic field trips, internships, career and college counseling, and college recruitment activities.

Program goal(s): Mott Middle College is a high school option for at-risk youth, it is open to all 21 public school districts in Genessee County, Michigan. Designed to deliver "intensive care" education to students who possess academic potential but are at risk of dropping out before the successful completion of high school or are achieving well below their potential.

Initiated by: Mott Middle College is a collaborative educational venture of Mott Community College, Genessee Intermediate School District, and the 21 public school districts within Genessee County. A representative Advisory Council provides guidance/ recommendations for the operation of Mott Middle College.

Funding: The program is made possible in part through a five-year grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

Program description: Mott Middle College is modeled on New York's successful La Guardia Community College middle college/high school program. The La Guardia Middle College is a high school aimed at students with ability who are in danger of dropping out of school. New York's single-district middle college program has been successfully replicated at Shelby State Community College in Tennessee, where, as is also true for La Guardia, the high school graduation rate is over 70 percent. Both middle colleges encourage students to dual enroll at their community college while they are high school students. Mott differs from other middle colleges in the United States by enrolling students from all 21 school districts in Genessee County.

The school opened in September 1991 with 120 sophomores and a staff of six full-time teachers, four part-time teachers, two administrators/counselors, and two support personnel.

The goals of Mott Middle College are: to create a learning community within a higher education environment by situating a high school on a college campus where college students act as role models and campus facilities are available; provide access to dual enrollment in college courses, permitting students to earn either high school or college credits; participate in formal work internship programs and intense career counseling; provide multiple academic, social, and career mentorships through college students' organizations and clubs;

schedule high school classes flexibly to fit with the college calendar; provide guidance for students using Reality Therapy and Discipline; emphasize learning from one's entire community—encourage academic field trips, internships, and off-site courses; provide an academic program, instructional delivery methods, co-curricular activities, and guidance components that are "student focused"—individual learning styles, emotional needs, and family-life circumstances become important factors in planning individual counseling and academic programs for each student; provide specialized career and college counseling for all students.

Companion programs: There are two. The first is the M-Link Program. This program is geared to facilitate the transfer of minority students from Mott Middle College to the University of Michigan on the Flint campus. (See description in the College Retention section of this appendix.)

The second companion program is the Center for Instructional Support. Its general program components are financial aid, organized classes to encourage high school completion, and preparation for the job market. It was initiated to address: lack of information, guidance with financial forms, promoting college-going culture/motivation, promoting academic achievement, avoiding dropping out.

Programs in the Center for Instructional Support are listed below:

1. Upward Bound Program: attempts to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school. The program provides students with academic, social, cultural, and financial resources that will help them graduate from high school and enter postsecondary education relevant to their career choice. Key components are: instruction in reading, writing, study skills, math, and other subjects necessary for success beyond high school; academic, financial, or personal counseling; exposure to cultural events; tutorial services; information on postsecondary education opportunities; assistance in completing college admissions testing and applications, and financial aid applications; exposure to career opportunities where disadvantaged persons might be underrepresented.

2. Single Parent/Homemaker Grant: offers assistance to students enrolled in vocational/technical programs and either ineligible for the Pell, or the Pell grant does not cover all educational expenses. Tuition, fees, books, supplies, equipment, and child care are covered for eligible participants. Key components include: organized educational programs for employment preparation; special

courses and activities on job-seeking skills; services to assist in personal, educational, and occupational decisionmaking.

3. Sex Equity Grant: offers assistance to students enrolled in vocational/technical programs and seeking employment in job areas that have not traditionally been considered jobs for their gender, for example, electronics for women and nursing for men. Students may either be ineligible for the Pell, or the Pell grant doesn't cover all educational expenses. The grant covers tuition, fees, books, supplies, and equipment for eligible participants. Key components include: organized educational programs for employment preparation; special courses and activities on job-seeking skills; and services to assist in personal, educational, and occupational decisionmaking.

4. Students Taking Academic Responsibility (STAR): encourages the development of positive, success-oriented strategies. Students are encouraged to network with each other as well as with the college community in solving problems. STAR will assist in short- and long-range planning to accomplish individual goals. As students utilize the existing college resources to improve their academic experience, they will receive STAR points, which may be traded in for a variety of social and cultural activities. Key components include: student academic plan, mentoring, a study area, and incentive bonus points.

5. MOST (Michigan Opportunity Skills Training Program): The MOST Program is funded by the Michigan Department of Social Services and provides reimbursements for child care and transportation to and from classroom areas for eligible enrolled students.

References: Interview with Bill Mitchell, Director of Guidance Services and Counseling, Mott Community College; and program materials.

CAREER BEGINNINGS
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, MASSACHUSETTS

Program emphasis: Awareness, information, and guidance.

General program components and targets: Career Beginnings includes educational services, summer employment, and mentoring. The program targets high school juniors with average academic performance who exceed minimum attendance requirements and demonstrate personal motivation and commitment beyond just school activities, for example, by working part time. A minimum of 50 percent of the students per site have to be economically disadvantaged, 80 percent with neither parent having a college diploma, and 45 percent male.

Program goal(s): Program materials state that the program aims "to increase the likelihood that inner-city high school students go on to college or, if that is not feasible, get good entry-level jobs." The program was based on the premise that urban students from low-income families receive little help in the steps necessary to gain admission to a college.

Initiated by: The program was initiated in 1986 by The Commonwealth Fund.

Funding: Major support is provided by the Gannett Foundation and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

Program description: By the program's second year, 1987–1988, it was operating in 24 sites, chosen through a national competition. The program varied by site, but in each site: (1) A local college or university served as the program sponsor and worked in collaboration with the public schools and business community. (2) Summer jobs were provided between the 11th and 12th grades. (3) Summer and senior workshops and classes on applying for financial aid and taking college entrance exams were provided, along with college and career fairs. (4) There was college and career counseling. (5) There were adult mentors.

Implementation: Sites that were judged to implement the program most effectively produced the largest impacts, and those judged to have the least successful implementation had the smallest impacts. Staffing, for example, ranged from no full-time staff in a site with negligible impacts, to a full-time project director and case manager, plus a dozen part-time staff, in a high-impact program.

Program evaluation: Seven sites were evaluated, with 1574 students randomly assigned to treatment and control groups. The final sample included 1233 students who responded to a one-year and two-year follow-up interview, occurring about the time of high school graduation and one year after graduation. Students in the control group did not

receive the Career Beginnings program, but they were not barred from receiving other services.

Sites included: Bronx, NY; Gary, Indiana (Indiana University Northwest); Indianapolis, Indiana (Butler University); Jacksonville, FL; Rochester, NY; Santa Ana, CA; Youngstown, OH.

Results: The program increased the rate of college attendance among treatment group students by 4.7 percent: from 48.5 percent for the control group to 53.2 for the treatment group. However, there was considerable variation by site, ranging from a negative impact to an increase of 10 percent over the control group.

Experimental group students were more likely to start college in the fall, by about 6 percent. By the spring, after more control group students had enrolled, the percent enrolled was still significant, at 47.9 percent of the experimental group versus 43.4 percent of the control group. Retention of both experimental and control group students was about 90 percent in four-year colleges and 81 percent at two-year colleges.

Program changes: The national coordinating office at Brandeis University has been moving toward a more prescriptive approach, including minimum staffing requirements.

Reference sources: George Cave and Janet Quint, *Career Beginnings Impact Evaluation: Findings from a Program for Disadvantaged High School Students, Executive Summary,* Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, New York, 1990.

TRIO

Program emphasis: Awareness, information, and guidance.

General program components: TRIO refers to five programs funded under the federal Higher Education Act of 1965: Educational Opportunity Centers, Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement Program, Student Support Services, Talent Search, and Upward Bound. The TRIO programs provide low-income, first-generation, and handicapped students the supportive services they need—counseling, basic skills instruction, tutoring, information on college admissions and financial aid—to enroll in and graduate from college. They are among the oldest models of programs to promote college going and college retention.

Initiated by: TRIO programs are authorized under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Program goal(s): TRIO's principal concern is to sustain and improve educational opportunity program services. TRIO projects currently operate in over 900 postsecondary institutions and more than 60 community agencies.

Program descriptions: Presently, over 900,000 students receive services from federal, state, and privately funded educational opportunity programs; more than 500,000 of these students are served by the federally funded TRIO programs. Among TRIO students, 41 percent are black, 35 percent are white, 17 percent are Hispanic, 4 percent are American Indian, and 3 percent are Asian. Over 14,000 of these students are physically handicapped, and two-thirds are from families in which the income is less than 150 percent of the poverty level and neither parent has graduated from college. The TRIO programs are briefly described below.

1. Educational Opportunity Centers: provide low-income adults with information about postsecondary education opportunities. The fiscal 1991 budget includes $14.1 million to finance 41 centers serving 112,000 people; approximately $125.89 per person.

2. Student Support Services: projects are intended to increase college graduation rates of low-income, first-generation, and disabled college students by providing them with tutoring, counseling, and remedial instruction. About 163,000 students are being served on 716 campuses with $120.7 million in fiscal 1991; approximately $704.49 per person.

3. Talent Search: projects are intended to encourage low-income and prospective first-generation college students to consider college opportunities while they are

in secondary school and to assist them in completing admissions and aid applications. The fiscal 1991 budget includes $46 million to finance projects administered by 203 colleges and community groups serving 262,860 students; approximately $175 per person.

4. Upward Bound: designed to prepare low-income and prospective first-generation college students for higher education by providing them with instruction in literature, composition, math, and science on college campuses after school, on Saturdays, and during the summer. About 49,000 high school students are served by 579 projects financed with $143.3 million in fiscal 1991.

   Instruction for students is provided by qualified professionals with good academic standing and degrees in the discipline they teach. The regulations of the federal government require teachers' resumes to be submitted beforehand to the Department of Education for approval.

   Students are recruited from high schools in the surrounding areas and must fit one or more of the criteria of the program, such as being a low-income or first-generation college student.

   There is coordination between the universities and the schools, especially for the summer program. The program director hires staff to supervise the students during their residential stay on campus. In addition, many parents actively participate in this program.

   Other services include counseling, mentoring, and social etiquette—teaching students how to behave in a variety of social situations.

   Expense varies depending on how many students are being served.

5. Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement Program: named for the astronaut killed in the 1986 Challenger explosion, it is intended to encourage low-income and minority undergraduates to consider careers in college teaching and to prepare them for doctoral study. The students are provided with research opportunities and faculty mentors. A fiscal 1991 appropriation of $5 million is supporting 29 programs serving 1475 students.

6. Staff Training and Program Evaluation: these programs are intended to prepare staff members of TRIO programs for their jobs and to assess the effectiveness of the programs. They account for $4.7 million of the fiscal 1991 appropriation for TRIO.

Evaluation Data: Upward Bound was evaluated by Research Triangle Institute. Over 3700 Upward Bound 12th grade participants from 54 randomly selected projects and a comparison group were followed for four years.

- 91 percent of Upward Bound students entered postsecondary institutions.
- The program "appears to have a beneficial impact on students' educational aspirations, postsecondary progress and persistence."
- Compared to a control group, students are more than twice as likely to enroll in four-year institutions.
- Participants took more advantage of financial aid.
- Students were four times as likely to have earned a baccalaureate after four years.

There is no national evaluation of Talent Search or the Educational Opportunity Center program.

References: Maureen Hoyler, Deputy Director, National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations (NCEOA); Barbara Bursett, Assistant Director of Development, NCEOA; program materials.

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY CENTER OF EXCELLENCE, INC.
HILLSBOROUGH, FLORIDA

Program emphasis: Awareness.

General program components: The Center provides academic enrichment, recognition of academic merit, remedial help in academic and study skills areas, field trips, college visits, preschool home instruction, tutoring, and scholarship competitions.

Program goal(s): The Hillsborough County Center of Excellence is one of ten such centers across Florida, dedicated to promoting and increasing the number of minority students attending college in the state. The other nine centers are located in Pensacola, Tallahassee, Lake City, Jacksonville, Gainesville, Orlando, St. Petersburg, Ft. Lauderdale, and Miami. The Center was initiated: (1) to increase the number of minority students who are motivated, prepared, qualified, and willing to pursue undergraduate degrees at postsecondary institutions; (2) to assist students in successfully completing high school academic requirements by providing academic enrichment in reading, science, math, English, and black history; (3) to increase awareness of the need for positive parental involvement in education; and (4) to provide an opportunity for students and their parents to participate in cultural enrichment activities. The Center collaborates with other community-based organizations and acts as a catalyst for mobilizing community resources, both financial and human, on behalf of youth in the community. An average total of about 1000 students are inducted into all ten centers yearly; about 7000 students have been inducted so far.

Funding: A three-year grant from the McKnight Foundation for $100,000 funded five centers from 1985 to 1987. At the present time, each of the ten centers receives $30,000 from the state, with additional funding from community-based organizations, grants, airline "mileage dollars," college-based funds, the Urban League, banks, American Airlines, and other organizations.

Initiated by: The McKnight Foundation in Minneapolis, Minnesota, provided the initial three-year seed funding from 1985–1987 for the first five centers.

Staffing: At present, there are two staff members, but in 1986, the McKnight Foundation funding provided for four staff members.

Program description: There are several programs operating out of the Hillsborough County Center:

1. McKnight Achievers Society: A McKnight Achiever is a student from kindergarten to college age who has achieved significantly in academic and/or cultural endeavors. The minimum academic criterion is that he/she be an A or B student. This must include a

minimum of two A's; the remaining grades may be all B's. No C's are acceptable in the Society. The goals of the society are: to recognize academic and cultural achievement; to connect achieving minority youth with potential significant others; and to have minority adults connect with minority youth, thus providing the potential for positive ongoing role models and the reduction of socioeconomic class differences.

2. The Summer Program: Provides reinforcement in reading, African-American history, English, and math, along with developing other skills such as study habits, listening, test-taking, following directions, and speaking before peers. The program also includes field trips to various points of interest, including college campuses. Designed for students from K–11, there are twenty students in each center directed by one teacher using a team-teaching approach to ensure a flexible atmosphere to better meet the needs of individual students.

3. After School Academic Enrichment Centers: operate during the regular school year and are housed in schools, churches, college campuses, and community centers. Students attending these centers receive assistance in completing their homework.

4. The Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY): This program was originally developed by the National Council of Jewish Women Research Institute for Innovation in Education at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem in Israel. HIPPY is designed for parents with limited formal schooling to provide educational enrichment for their preschool children. Support and training for the parents are given by paraprofessionals, themselves parents of young children from the communities served by the program.

Research findings suggest that HIPPY has positive impacts on participating mothers by improving their overall self-concept and by increasing their interest and involvement in community affairs, as well as their interest in pursuing further education for themselves.

The first HIPPY programs were established in the United States in 1984. Presently, there are about 3000 economically disadvantaged families participating in programs operating in eleven states; three operate in Florida. All United States HIPPY programs are affiliated with and receive training and technical assistance from HIPPY-USA—a project of NCJW (National Council of Jewish Women), Center for the Child.

HIPPY parents allot time each day to work with their children using packets of materials appropriate to the children's developmental level. Paraprofessionals visit each parent at home every other week, bringing the storybook and highly structured packet of activities for that week. Role playing is used to instruct parents in the use of materials. On alternate weeks, small groups of parents meet with their paraprofessional to review HIPPY

materials, develop parent-as-educator skills, and address other topics of special interest to parents.

HIPPY is not only a home-based instruction program; it: (a) empowers parents as children's primary educators; (b) provides children with school-readiness skills; (c) brings literacy into the home and serves hard-to-reach families; (d) promotes dialogue within the community; (e) provides lower-income communities with jobs—HIPPY hires and trains paraprofessionals from the community, offering many people their first job; (f) is based on a community empowerment model by training paraprofessionals from the community—by working from within, HIPPY builds trust among parents, paraprofessionals, and the professional coordinator.

5. Scholarship Programs: Most colleges in the state have scholarship programs. All ten centers conduct academic competitions to win local scholarships by creating seven-member teams of students in grades 7–12 who are required to memorize about 2000 facts on black history, read a certain number of required books, and more.

6. Black History and Cultural Brain Bowl: Created as an incentive to encourage African-American youth to know and understand their history, the Florida Endowment Fund for Higher Education sponsors annual "Black History and Cultural Brain Bowl Competitions." This activity complements the yearlong community-based African-American history programs, which are initiated and sustained by the ten Centers of Excellence located throughout the state. The Brain Bowl competition is open to youth in grades 7 through 12. Competing teams must be sponsored by schools, churches, social and fraternal groups, and/or local community organizations. An organization may sponsor only one team. All persons entering the competition will, at a minimum, receive a certificate of participation. Major awards and prizes will include college partial or full scholarships, U.S. Savings Bonds, trophies, plaques, merchandise, and, if the team progresses to the finals, a weekend spent at the Hyatt Regency in Tampa.

Evaluation: An evaluation is being planned for the near future.

References: Interview with Dr. Mary Lindse, Executive Director, Hillsborough County Center of Excellence, Inc., HIPPY Program (Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters); program materials.

SCHOLARSHIP-IN-ESCROW (SIE)
CLEVELAND, OHIO

Program emphasis: Awareness.

General program components; target group: Students in grades 7 to 12 are rewarded for getting good grades in five core academic subjects. The money may be spent on continuing education within eight years of high school graduation.

Program goal(s): SIE targets at-risk students and provides an advocate at the school to resolve problems and encourage students to go to college.

Initiated by: Begun in 1987, with the details worked out by a task force of the Greater Cleveland Roundtable and bank accounts devised by Ameritrust.

Funds: $16 million was raised from the business community for a five-year pilot program in pledges payable over five years. $10 million went to the SIE program and $6 million to the companion school-to-work program. Contributors included The Cleveland Foundation ($3 million); TRW, Inc. and the Eaton Corp. pledged $2 million. Twenty-five higher education institutions have pledged to match the SIE dollars earned with 1:1, 2:1, and, in one case, 4:1 institutional funds. Institutions include Oberlin College and Case Western Reserve University.

Staffing: Support services are provided by 29 full-time advocates based in 35 schools. These advocates increase awareness of the incentive program for the total student body, and they are assigned 60 target students, with grade point averages ranging from 1.8–2.6, for whom they coordinate support services, such as tutoring, and provide personal counseling.

Program description: The program rewards students for good grades in grades 7 to 12. Students earn $40 for each A, $20 for each B, and $10 for each C in five core academic subjects, plus $10 for each honors class. Students must spend this money on continuing education within eight years or forfeit it. (Students leaving the system also forfeit the money.) Students began earning SIE dollars in February 1988.

Funds are deposited into an escrow account for students. At each quarterly marking period, students receive an account of their earnings. All Cleveland public students in grades 7 to 12 (approximately 28,000) are eligible. The maximum a student can earn is $6000. After a student is accepted and enrolled in a college, the money is sent to the college in the student's name. The money can be used for tuition, books, room and board, etc., with no strings attached. As of November 1991, $593,000 was dispersed to 225 colleges and universities. The 1988 funds were dispersed in lump sums, the 1989 funds across two years, the 1990 funds across three years, and the 1991-and-beyond funds over four years.

The program is provided office space by the Cleveland school district, free of charge, as well as space within the schools. It has a good rapport with the district and is able to access information quickly.

Program evaluation: In 1987, about 40 percent of students earned only D's and F's in core academic subjects. In the class of 1991, over 2000 of the 2900 students had earned some SIE dollars (69 percent). Within five months of graduation, 523 students from the class of 1991 had asked for their SIE dollars. There is no baseline data on the number of students who went to college before the program began.

The program is currently being evaluated by Public Private Ventures (paid for by British Petroleum USA, the Gunn Foundation, and the Cleveland Foundation). Some preliminary results indicate that average SIE earnings increased 12 percent in the last marking period; there has been a 17 percent increase in the number of students taking college entrance exams.

Companion Programs: 1. Cleveland Scholarship Program: provides information and guidance in identifying and applying for college and financial aid; provides last-dollar scholarships. 2. Cleveland Initiative for Education: established in 1986 by the district superintendent to increase the holding power of schools and offset the 50 percent drop-out rate. School-to-work youth transition programs provide summer jobs and priority hiring for Cleveland public school graduates. Youth Opportunities Unlimited, a nonprofit organization, conducted job-readiness training and arranged summer jobs for 2000 students and community service projects for 600 students.

Recommended contacts: Boston, Baltimore, New York, and Miami, Columbus, Dayton, and Cuyahoga County (Ohio), and Norfolk, Richmond, and Alexandria (Virginia) are among cities influenced by the Cleveland program.

Reference sources: Joseph Cronin, "Corporate Support for Scholarships: A Tale of Two Cities," in A. M. Hauptman and R. H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College*, American Council on Education, MacMillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991, pp. 129–147. Interview with Christina Ryan Milano, Executive Director of CSP. Interview with Rosie Dowdy, Executive Director of SIE. Program brochures and materials.

CHALLENGE FOR EXCELLENCE
TEXAS SOUTHMOST COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, BROWNSVILLE

Program emphasis: Awareness.

General program components: The Challenge program guarantees credits toward college tuition for students who make good grades beginning in junior high.

Program goal(s): The program addresses several needs: promoting a college-going culture, increasing motivation to attend college, supplying financial aid, promoting academic achievement, and lowering the drop-out rate. The endowment scholarship program was designed to fight three basic problems facing the community: (1) retention: 36 percent of Hispanic students quit school before the 5th grade; the dropout rate at local high schools is about 50 percent; (2) academic preparation: incoming college freshmen were assessed at the 7th and 8th grade levels in math and reading skills; 92 percent of the incoming college freshmen lacked the writing skills necessary to qualify for freshman English classes; (3) financial need: 72 percent of the college's students depend on financial aid.

Initiated by: The Board of Trustees of Texas SouthMost College initiated the program.

Funds: The college submitted a proposal to the Department of Education for an Endowment Challenge Grant, one of several programs authorized by Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, known as the Institutional Aid Programs. In December 1987, a $2,000,000 Challenge Grant was awarded to Texas SouthMost College by the Department of Education. The grant committed the college to raise $1,000,000 by June of 1989 in order to qualify for the matching grant. It secured $100,000 from each of the following: The Meadows Foundation in Dallas, The Sid Richardson Foundation in Fort Worth, and the Brownsville Foundation and the Brownsville Foundation for Health & Education; $50,000 was raised from Southwestern Bell Corporation and Anheuser Busch. The balance of the million dollars was obtained by community fundraising activities. This $3 million principal is invested for 20 years. Half the yearly interest will be applied to scholarships, while the remainder will be used to build and perpetuate the endowment.

Staffing: To ensure that the endowment is a collaborative effort, Dr. Torres, the Endowment Director, meets regularly with three groups of people: a liaison team, an advisory committee, and an implementation team. The liaison team is a decisionmaking group and includes one assistant superintendent from each of the public school districts and a principal from each of the private schools. This team addresses issues pertaining to the

endowment implementation and gives an equal voice to all schools involved. It is important that the schools "own" the program and take responsibility for its success within their schools and for their students. The second group, the advisory committee, became a necessary addition because of the size of the Brownsville Independent School District, which is 80 percent of the college district with a student population of over 36,000 students. It consists of a secondary teacher or counselor from each of the secondary campuses in the college district. Also included is an elementary school teacher or principal from each school district to represent that population. The advisory committee representative is the director's contact person as well as the "endowment expert" on his or her own campus. This allows for closer contact with the students who will be arriving on campus in the fall of 1994.

Program description: Scholarship dollars are earned from grades 7 through 12 and are applicable toward in-district tuition and fees for the freshman and sophomore years at Texas SouthMost Community College on the campus of the University of Texas at Brownsville. 1991 is the first year of a partnership agreement between the community college and the university that basically combines resources to eliminate any barriers for students to transfer from the community college to the University of Texas after completing the 60 hours of scholarship credits allowed in this program. Students now can receive an A.A. degree at SouthMost and proceed on track to receive a B.A. two years later at the University of Texas without reapplying. The Challenge for Excellence endowment scholarship program encourages students to earn "scholarship dollars" by obtaining above-average grades: A's and B's. Tuition and fee credit are as follows: One A earns in-district tuition and fees for one college credit hour. One B earns in-district tuition and fees for one-third college credit hour. For honors classes, an A will earn in-district tuition and fees for one and one-third college credit hours and a B will earn in-district tuition and fees for one college credit hour. The scholarship dollars are applicable toward in-district tuition and fees only at the University of Texas at Brownsville in partnership with Texas SouthMost College. Credits are not redeemable for cash.

This program began in September 1989 for all 7th and 8th graders attending accredited public and private schools within the college district; included are schools in Brownsville, Pt. Isabel, and Los Fresnos. During 1990–1991, the 9th grade was added; in 1991–1992, the 10th grade was added; in 1992–1993, the 11th grade will be added; in 1993 the 12th grade will be added; and in 1994, implementation on the college campus will start.

The goal of the program is to provide the opportunity for each student to earn full tuition assistance for the 60 to 62 hours required to achieve a degree or an occupational-

technical training program certificate. Currently, 26 elementary schools are participating, along with 8 intermediate schools and 9 high schools.

Courses in the core areas for which "Scholarship Dollars" may be earned are: English, math, social studies, science, reading (7th and 8th grade), and foreign language (high school). Only A's and B's in grade-level (college preparatory) courses are eligible for funding. These "scholarship dollars" are earned twice a year, at the end of each semester.

Students and their parents will receive semiannual statements of the amount accumulated at the end of each semester when the "scholarship credits" are awarded. Because parental involvement is most critical to the achievement of the program objectives, meetings for parents of students enrolled in the program will take place to train the parents and emphasize the importance of education as a prerequisite for earning "scholarship credits."

A student must meet the following requirements in order to receive "scholarship dollars": (1) earn a diploma by graduating from high school, or (2) earn a GED and (3) be concurrently enrolled at the University of Texas at Brownsville in Partnership with Texas SouthMost College and an accredited school within the college district.

Program evaluation: During the first year of implementation, 55 percent of the eligible students earned "scholarship dollars" and began their savings account for college. That number grew to 60 percent for the second year, with these students earning tuition and fees for a cumulative total of 35,540 college credit hours earned by more than 7000 students. The program is still evolving through the collaborative efforts of Texas SouthMost College, Brownsville Independent School District, First Baptist School, Los Fresnos Independent School District, Pt. Isabel Independent School District, St. Joseph Academy, and Villa Maria of the Incarnate Word.

Note: The Family Privacy Act limits access to more student data. The amount of total scholarship credits earned as well as the aggregate data from each school showing its total enrollment by grade level is available.

References: Interview with Dr. Belinda Torres, Director, Texas SouthMost College; program materials.

M-LINK
MOTT MIDDLE COLLEGE – UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Program emphasis: College recruitment and retention.

General program components: This program is geared to facilitate the transfer of minority students from Mott Middle College to the University of Michigan on the Flint campus. (For a description of Mott Middle College, see the "Awareness" section of this appendix.)

Funding: It is funded by a $100,000 grant from the Office of Minority Equity in the Michigan Department of Education. The grant is renewable after the first eighteen months for an additional eighteen months.

Program description: The Director of M-Link, a graduate of Mott and the University of Michigan at Flint, spends half-time at Mott and half-time at the university coordinating and facilitating the transfer of Mott students to the Flint campus. She is sensitive to the procedures at the university campus and holds rap sessions at Mott to help the students become more familiar with the rules and regulations of their new campus. Special events are sponsored, and information coffee-hour sessions are a regular event to make students feel more comfortable. In addition, financial incentives are offered for first-semester students, such as deferred fees and waiver of book fees, to let students know that "we care for you," and that they are important.

Students at Mott interested in transferring to other college campuses can do so easily because of the careful articulation mechanism in place at Mott. Courses also translate to parallel other college courses in four-year institutions statewide. Counselors at Mott devote half their time to helping students ready themselves to transfer elsewhere. Advisement days are set up with admissions officers from college campuses to visit Mott to meet with interested students.

Evaluation: There was a 20 percent increase of minority transfer students to the Flint campus in 1991, and roughly 48 percent of students at Mott go on to some other institution of higher education.

References: Interview with Bill Mitchell, Director of Guidance Services and Counseling, Mott Community College; program materials.

ACADEMIC ADVANCEMENT CENTER
GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE, NEW JERSEY

Program emphasis: College retention.

General program components: The college has an extensive retention, program including mentoring, a precollege summer program, tutoring, and academic and career counseling.

Program description: A yearlong retention program supports students experiencing academic difficulty by providing academic and career-goal counseling and residential and student life programs. For minority students, there is a precollege summer experience. This summer program is a "highlight" and a major component of the retention effort, giving 90–100 precollege freshmen a remedial session of six weeks of study-skills readiness training as well as workshops on emotional readiness for the college experience. Special guest speakers are recruited as role models to motivate students. In addition, tutors are paid to build academic readiness and bolster confidence. Most of these students are underprepared academically and emotionally to face the rigorous challenges of college life, so this six-week program was designed as an intense experience to build self esteem, sharpen study skills, and provide "heavy doses of motivation" by sending the message "that each student can succeed in college."

In addition, there is an educational opportunity fund to help educationally and economically deprived students by providing special state scholarship money and specifically earmarked money for college. There is also matching money to pay the salaries of counselors to advise these students.

The center has developed an "intrusive advising technique," which tries to "identify the scratch before the itch develops" in high-risk students who have not declared a major field of study. Once recruited to join the center, counselors help the student define abilities, goals, and interests that would be best developed in college, coupled with career goals and aspirations. The career development office and academic advising office have been merged to work more effectively. According to a respondent, "the connection between academic advising and career planning has come together in forming a seamless whole."

Program evaluation: The program was evaluated by Temple University. Results from the evaluation showed that the college was "a nose above the national average for public colleges," and that the school increased its retention rate by 5 percent over the past three to four years.

Companion programs: Along with the center, there is a campuswide effort to increase retention, including a Freshman Seminar course, a two-day student-parent freshman orientation session, a proactive mentoring and advising program for freshmen, peer tutoring for minority students, and tutoring support in mathematics and English to prepare for difficult classes.

Reference: Interview with Dr. Linda Ross, Vice President, Glassboro State College, New Jersey; program materials.

SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION (SI)
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, KANSAS CITY

Program emphasis: College retention.

General program components: The program is designed to assist students in mastering course concepts in difficult courses while increasing their competency in reading, reasoning, and study skills. "Student specialists" who are knowledgeable in the content of a course set up 50-minute coaching sessions three or four times a week. These sessions are voluntary and are purely collaborative in approach, not directive.

Program goal(s): It is designed to reduce attrition and increase the level of student performance in courses that are historically difficult for college students. It is the largest academic model in the United States in which leaders use a mentoring/collaborative approach to learning and understanding difficult subjects.

Initiated by: Dr. Deanna Martin initiated the program in 1973 as a method to stop the attrition rate in the Medical and Health Sciences Graduate School at the University of Missouri at Kansas City. Dr. Martin noticed that many students in the six-year (year round) program for a B.A. and M.D. degree at the university taking their first anatomy or physiology classes earned D's or F's and began withdrawing from these difficult classes. Dr. Martin's approach provides an academic support system in which trained instructors "coach" students studying in collaborative groups.

Funding: The university pays each student leader $750 a semester. Some schools apply for Title III or Title IV special-services grant funds when beginning SI programs. The program at the University of Missouri started with a grant from the Health Career Opportunity Program, U.S. Department of Education, to help low-income students pursue careers in health fields.

Staffing: The Academic Center employs seventeen people. For the SI program, there is one supervisor for every five SI leaders, and there are about fifteen SI leaders each term.

Program description: This is a highly interactive group-assistance program attached to traditionally difficult courses—courses where a third or more of the enrolled students are expected to earn grades of D or to withdraw. SI leaders have attended the particular class and have been approved by the professor. The SI leader is trained to use special techniques to work with students to insure that they understand the material the professor is presenting. SI was initiated as an instructional solution to high attrition rates among students in health sciences schools. SI targets courses that are difficult for students instead of targeting students who are having difficulty in courses. SI is open to all students

in the course and is, by intent and design, committed to assisting and retaining the best prepared as well as the least prepared. Piloted at the School of Medicine at the University of Missouri at Kansas City, the program has expanded to undergraduate Arts and Science courses.

According to the respondent, SI is the most widely used student academic support program in the nation today. Last year, in a national competition sponsored by the Noel/Levitz National Center for Student Retention, a jury of experts selected SI as the nation's finest student retention program. Previously, the U.S. Department of Education certified SI as an Exemplary Education Program. Since 1984, the U.S. Department of Education has awarded the University of Missouri at Kansas City $493,926 to help other colleges implement the SI model. Personnel from nearly 400 American colleges and universities have received training to implement the program. The university currently receives SI data from 160 institutions.

Evaluation: Participants typically improve their grades by one-half to one letter grade, according to the respondent. This program helped the university retain its minority students enrolled in "high-risk" courses while reducing the dropout rate in the medical and health science programs. On average, in each class where SI is offered, three additional students who participated in SI would re-enroll at the university during the next semester who would normally have dropped out. Also, in a study of all 3943 students enrolled in courses where SI was available, attending SI sessions was a significant factor in attaining a passing grade in the course.

References: Interview with Dr. Deanna Martin, Director, Supplemental Instruction and the Center for Academic Development; program materials.

NONTRADITIONAL FINANCIAL SELF-HELP PROGRAMS

Several nontraditional methods have been developed to provide assistance in financing a college education. The federal government has eased the tax burden on U.S. savings bonds used for higher education expenses,[2] and private agencies have joined the federal government and the states in offering student loans based on credit checks. Below we describe three recent self-help program developments: guaranteed tuition, savings bonds, and community work programs.

Guaranteed Tuition Plans

Guaranteed tuition plans allow the prepayment of college tuition before children matriculate. The model for this type of program was developed by Michigan in 1986. However, a 1988 IRS ruling concerning the Michigan program questioned the tax status of these plans, and other states have been reluctant to pursue plans they have adopted for state postsecondary institutions.[3]

Guaranteed tuition plans offer the security of paid-up tuition, and are perceived by parents as an insurance policy against higher costs. Potential risks for the states are the shift of the inflationary risk from parents to the state unless states can successfully invest the money to generate earnings matching future costs. Some private universities have instituted guaranteed tuition plans, but many have suspended them because of poor investment returns and higher-than-expected tuition costs.

In the Michigan plan, the tuition guarantee is good for attendance at any state higher education institution offering a bachelor's degree. Students may attend a two-year college first, or may request a prorated refund if they graduate from a two-year college. As of August 1988, prices ranged from $1689 for a year's tuition for a newborn, to $2055 for a ten year old. As of September 1988, 27,000 guarantees were purchased out of the 82,000 that were approved (see Merisotis (1991) for further details).

---

[2]An amendment in 1988 to the 1986 Tax Reform Act "excludes from gross taxable income the amount earned through the redemption of U.S. savings bonds if the funds are used to pay for qualified higher-education expenses," i.e., the tuition and fees of the taxpayer or spouse or dependent. The amount is reduced by any other nontaxable payment for educational expenses, such as veteran's benefits. Full benefits are available for single filers with incomes of less than $40,000 (prorated for $40,000–$60,000) and joint filers with incomes of less than $60,000 (prorated for $60,000–$90,000). The eligibility is annually adjusted for inflation. The measure is effective for bonds issued after December 31, 1991 (Merisotis, 1991).

[3]States adopting plans: Alabama, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and Wyoming. States implementing plans: Florida, Michigan, Ohio, and Wyoming.

College Savings Bond Plans

College Savings Bonds are usually part of larger general-obligation bond issues. They are exempt from state and federal taxes for residents of the state in which they are purchased. Usually, they are zero-coupon bonds, with interest paid at maturity. They are typically sold with face values of $5000 and maturities ranging from 5 to 20 years. Interest rates vary from 6 to 8 percent, depending on market conditions.

The advantages of this approach are that: (1) Families are encouraged to save for education by purchasing tax-exempt bonds. (2) States do not have to pay interest until maturity. (3) The bonds are attractive to state treasurers, since large-denomination general-obligation bonds are less attractive to large investors because of changes in the 1986 Tax Reform Act.[4] Potential risks for parents are that the bonds may not keep pace with inflation, or that they may not be available on an ongoing basis because they are usually part of a larger general-obligation bond issue. (For further details on these plans see McGuinness and Paulson, 1990).

In December 1987, Illinois initiated the Baccalaureate Savings Act program, a national marketing of general-obligation bonds as college savings bonds with a value of $1120–$3695 and maturities from 5 to 20 years. These bonds were exempt from state income tax, and a 0.5 percent bonus interest rate was awarded if funds were used for in-state tuition; in addition, the state gave an exemption of up to $25,000 from state student aid need-analysis calculations. The first issue of $90 million sold out in three days; the second of $175 million sold out in five days. Other states have also had success in selling similar bonds: North Carolina sold approximately $30 million in the first year, North Dakota sold $15 million, Oregon sold $15 million, and Washington sold $50 million—as of December 1988 (Merisotis, 1991).

Indiana has experimented with several prepayment and savings plans. A guaranteed tuition plan was enacted in 1987, Baccalaureate Education System Trust (BEST), House Bill 1028. It was not brought into compliance with IRS tax rulings and has not been implemented. In November 1989, the governor authorized educational savings through general-obligation bonds. A college savings program has been implemented by Ball State University and Indiana University.

---

[4]States adopting plans: Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. (Minnesota did not implement its plan.)

Public Service Student Financial Assistance Programs

In the 1980s, concern about rising college costs and student indebtedness became linked to government and institutional interest in public service. The 1986 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act allowed colleges to use a percentage of College Work Study (CWS) and State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) funds to support community-service activities (Mohrman and Stroud, 1991). Generally, work-study and community-service programs take the form of a service payback for financial aid or tuition remission, or loan deferment or cancellation in return for community service. For example, Westmont College in California trades community service for tuition credits based on hours/week of service ($400 for 8 hours/week, to $800 for 16 hours/week). Corporations and foundations may also link scholarship funds to community service. The Stride-Rite Corporation provides ten scholarships a year to needy first-year Harvard students who work in social service agencies during all of their undergraduate years ($1500 scholarship, $3000 work subsidy, $500 for books); and the Charles A. Dana Foundation, through a competitive grants program to eastern institutions, has provided about $6 million to 28 colleges, leveraging $17 million in matching funds for 5000 student jobs. Among the programs for which institutions have used the funds is one program at Wheaton College, Massachusetts, to underwrite twelve students on financial aid to work full-time in summer community-service projects with local human-service agencies.

REFERENCES

Cargile, S.D., "Strengthening Black Students' Academic Preparedness for Higher Education," *Journal of Black Studies,* Vol. 19, No. 2, December 1988.

Cave, G., and J. Quint, *Career Beginnings Impact Evaluation: Findings from a Program for Disadvantaged High School Students,* Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, New York, 1990.

Cronin, J., "Corporate Support for Scholarships: A Tale of Two Cities" in A.M. Hauptman and R.H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College,* American Council on Education, MacMillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991.

Higher Education Information Center, *A Sampler of Early Higher Education Awareness Programs,* Boston, October 1987.

Hossler, D., J. Schmit, and G. Bouse, "Family Knowledge of Postsecondary Costs and Financial Aid," *Journal of Student Financial Aid,* Vol. 21, No. 1, Winter 1991.

Keitel, P.J., "New York State's Liberty Scholarship Program," in A.M. Hauptman and R.H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College,* American Council on Education, MacMillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991.

Klein, S.P., S.J. Carroll, J. Hawes-Dawson, and D. McCaffrey, *Interactions Among Gift-Aid Programs in Indiana,* RAND, R-4218-LE, 1992.

Koff, R.H, "Philanthropy, the Public School, and the University: The Albany Dreamers' Program As A Model for At Risk Youth," in A.M. Hauptman and R.H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College,* American Council on Education, MacMillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991.

McGuinness, A.C., Jr., and C. Paulson, "A Survey of College Prepayment and Savings Plans in the States," in J.S. Hansen (ed.), *College Savings Plans, Public Policy Choices,* The College Board, College Entrance Examinations Board, New York, 1990.

Merisotis, J.P., "An Inventory of Innovative Financing Plans To Help Pay for Higher Education," in A.M. Hauptman and R.H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College,* American Council on Education, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991.

Mingle, J.R., *Trends in Higher Education Participation and Success,* Education Commission of the States and the State Higher Education Executive Offices, Denver, CO, 1987.

Mohrman, K., and S. Stroud, "Public Service and Student Financial Aid," in A.M. Hauptman and R.H. Koff (eds.), *New Ways of Paying for College,* American Council on Education, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, 1991.

Pelavin, S.H., and M. Kane, *Changing the Odds: Factors Increasing Access to College,* College Entrance Examinations Board, New York, 1990.

Post, D., "College-Going Decisions by Chicanos: The Politics of Misinformation," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* Vol. 12, No. 2, Summer 1990

St. John, E.P., "What Really Influences Minority Attendance?" *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 32, No. 2, 1991.

Uyeki, E.S., *Retrospective Survey of Students Assisted by Cleveland Scholarship Programs, Inc. 1967–1983*, Cleveland Scholarship Programs, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, 1988.

U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), *Directory of Guaranteed Tuition Projects*, April 1990a.

U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), *Promising Practice, Private Programs Guaranteeing Student Aid for Higher Education*, GAO/PEMD-90–16, Report to the Chairman [Hon. Edward Kennedy], Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C., June 1990b.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE